

Proposal Reviews

#256: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Yolo Basin Foundation

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Delta Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 256

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	X
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$394,919.00**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The idea of a Pacific Flyway Center is consistent with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. However, the current proposal identifies planning efforts without an adequate amount of information to justify the expenditure of funds at this time. The Selection Panel recommends that the applicants revise the proposal to address the Environmental Education and the regional panels' comments and resubmit it for consideration as a directed project.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Environmental Education Technical Review Form

Proposal Number: 256

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	A Pacific Flyway Center at this location would serve the region and local communities well. The Center could showcase several concepts (Pacific Flyway, Wetlands, agriculture, etc.) and be a focal point for CALFED to focus on the River, Yolo bypass, Delta connections. The concern is that the grant amount requested is for physical planning only and does not guarantee that the center will be built. Planning to maximize the site's educational potential and for the facilities long term operations needs to occur first or simultaneously, but isn't fleshed out. What is the number of anticipated visitors? How will it be advertised to get people off the Interstate or to see it as a destination point. How will the Center sustain itself? Other visitor centers and Natural History Museums have failed, i. e. The Natural History Museum in Ashland, OR.
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Clearly stated educational goals, objectives and expected outcomes.** Are the project's educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem? Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration?

Are the projects educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? YES.

Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? YES.
Has potential to reach large audience of I-80 travelers and Sacramento metro residents.

Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem system? YES, if the project actually gets built this proposal is for initial planning phase.

Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration? YES, again, if it is built and interpretive displays are well designed.

2. **Justification (including conceptual model, likelihood of success).** Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? Is it supported by research or past results?

Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? YES.

Is it supported by research or past results? The Discover the Flyway Program is successful with thousands of students, hundreds of parents and teachers. This program has past funding from CALFED. The Center has the potential to reach thousands of additional individuals.

3. **Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).** Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants?

Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? N/A because this proposal involves an initial planning phase only.

Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? One would assume that appropriate interpretive materials would be developed once the Center was built.

Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants? N/A

4. **Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value).** Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities?

Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? Partnerships would be sought.

For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? N/A

Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities? It will expand upon the the existing Discover the Flyway Program already in use.

5. **Replicability and dissemination of the program or project.** Can the project be replicated, if successful? Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others?

Can the project be replicated, if successful? Yes, if the Center is built, it could be advertised.

Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others? At this stage, N/A

6. **Pre- and post-project evaluation component.** Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

The evaluation of this proposal would be based on the developed plans.

7. **Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).** Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended?

Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? There were no qualifications listed for current staff members. A previous highly successful project is described, though. There is no information about the design group who are they? what are their qualifications?

Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Only as it applies to a project that was funded by CALFED. There is no mention to include teachers, students and others in the planning phase of the Center.

Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? It would work on partnerships. No mention is made how actual construction would be funded.

Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended? NO.

8. **Cost/benefit.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The panel felt that many of the budget items seemed inflated and that overall the project was costly for an initial planning phase.

9. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Medium- See the Delta Regional Review High See the Sacramento Regional Review

10. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

Environmental Compliance Federal Funds require NEPA compliance Budget cost share imbalance - inflated

Miscellaneous comments:

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 256

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel agreed that while this could be a desirable project, it may not be a funding priority for this year. No time sensitivity issues known (the State owns the property on which this facility would be located).

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The Yolo Basin Foundation, through several previous CALFED grants, has established working relationships with various interest groups, landowners, and agencies in the Yolo Bypass. As this is a planning effort for a future facility on land currently owned by the State (WCB), the project should not be held up by permitting or access issues (Reclamation Board?).

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

MR-3: Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope. This grant would fund the planning of a major educational and interpretive facility.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

See answer to 1.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

See answer to 1.

Other Comments:

There was a question of the relationship of this proposed facility to the Delta Science Center at Big Break and CALFED's proposed science facility at Rio Vista.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 256

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel was supportive of the Flyway Center concept as a useful tool for both K-12 and adult education activities linked to the Bypass and the Pacific Flyway. Strong organizational history.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Program is already established with the "Discover the Flyway" project and site proximity to the Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area. No known local constraints exist, but this project is designed to uncover any.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Under M-3 Multi-Regional Education Priorities to develop adult & K-12 programs on conservation , restoration, & monitoring through curriculum development and hands-on. Builds on current program by providing the planning process (in-part) for a year-round ed. Center. May include info on CALFED activities.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife area and the Yolo Bypass.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Is an outreach project and the Foundation has a history of strong partnerships and outreach.

Other Comments:

Positive: Necessary step to meet future goal of an ed center to showcase the wildlife area and other regional wildlife and restoration activities, especially those linked to migrating waterfowl in the Pacific Flyway. Could be a nice central location to showcase CALFED programs and activities. YBF is experienced and has solid partners and support.

Negatives: Some tasks in the budget seem inflated for the consultant (e.g. ag soils analysis, archeological assess., farmland compat., access road assess.). A link to agriculture is mentioned but unclear how they define, "compatibility." Budget figures in the Budget Summary and "suggested project budget" are \$55,205 apart. They are asking for a \$51K contingency to be included. Seems unreasonable. There're no adaptive management plans nor Performance Measures included in the proposal.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 256

New Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

CALFED #98-B34, USBR #99-FC-20-0043 - Yolo Basin Foundation - Discover the Flyway

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

-Yes -No ☒N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Unknown?

NOTE - I was not the person actually involved in the original dealings with the agreement, so I am not personally aware of how this part of the process went.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

None

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 256

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Unless:

NEPA compliance would be necessary if the project includes federal cost-share funds (USACE and USBR).

Response to Land Use Checklist Item #2 (requiring access across property not owned by applicant) does not correspond with Environmental Compliance Checklist Item #5 (permission to access property required).

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 256

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

Funding carried forward does not match funding requested, seems to be a difference with cost share

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: